

CANDOUR *The British Views - Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol 41, Nos 6 & 7

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

June/July 1989

DEJA VU - AND THIS MEANS ALL

by DON BELL

The television screens showed elements of the 27th Peoples Liberation Army murdering hundreds of their own people. As we watched, we remembered that we had witnessed something like this years before. 62 years ago we were in China, probably the youngest member of the 4th United States Marines who had been sent to China to protect American lives, personnel and property, and to keep the peace within the International Settlements. But not like the Marines in Beirut, Lebanon. They, while still living, patrolled the streets and byways with empty arms. We carried Springfield rifles or Colt .45s or both, loaded and with extra ammunition. We were ordered to fire if fired upon or when Chinese troops tried to enter the British or French Concessions. A very ugly and bloody civil war was waging in the native sections of China's largest city. There was comparative peace within the Settlements. But outside, Chinese warlords pledged to the support of Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang or to Mao Tse-tung's Communist hordes, were battling each other to the death. All who stood in their way were murdered. The worst spot was the area surrounding the railway station. There were no modern conveyances in China in 1927 and the only quick way to get out of the city and to possible safety in the fields was by train. But the people didn't know that the trains had been stopped. As the people waited, thousands were murdered in and around the station. Bodies were piled four deep in some spots. When Pearl Harbor was attacked and our War Fleet destroyed, the 4th Marines were still in Shanghai or were being sent sent to Bataan in the Philippines. That's where we witnessed carnage the second time, this time as a war correspondent, when the Japanese bombed Clark and Nichols Fields and Manila, and took us prisoner of war. But let's put these massacres of innocents in proper context.

War and revolution, death and destruction have always been too frequent in the Orient. The United States were a very young Nation when wars between the white and yellow races began. At the turn of the 19th century the British citizenry developed a craze for China tea. Britain was the most powerful and far flung empire in the world, and China was the largest and most populous empire in the world. Britain, being a commercial empire and china being a closed and forbidden empire, that first great Drug War seemed inevitable. The British had gotten unlimited tons of opium by way of India, and sought a place to sell it for profit. As is the United States today, China in 1825 was the ideal customer for drugs. So, a brisk sale of opium and purchase of tea began. But the Emperor of the Ch'ing Dynasty learned of what was happening to his people because of the drugs and

he ordered all users of opium executed. His troops commandeered and destroyed all the British-held opium, much as the Americans had destroyed the British-held tea in Boston Harbor. In both cases, war followed. But the Chinese lost their war. The (London) Times Concise Atlas of World History (1982) explains:

"The opium war had two major consequences. First, it resulted in the cession of Hong Kong to the British and the opening of the first five Treaty Ports....in which foreigners enjoyed extraterritorial rights. Secondly, it weakened imperial authority and led to the great Taiping rebellion (1850-64), the most serious but only one of many rebellions which shook Manchu power to its foundations. The Taiping and Nien revolutions alone left 25 million dead and vast areas (especially around Nanking-Ed.) were devastated." In 1900 came the Boxer uprising which was suppressed by the allied foreign forces. After that revolutionary groups led by warlords sprang up everywhere. In 1911 the Manchu government fell almost without fighting. The infant emperor was pensioned and allowed the run of the Imperial Palace. (A recent movie was based on the story of the last emperor. It may have been partially factual. We didn't bother to see it.)

Chiang Kai-Shek's Rise To Power

In 1912, Yuan Shih-k'ai, most popular of the warlords at that time, was asked to take command and try to unite China. His efforts proved fruitless. Meanwhile, a Christian who had been educated in western schools, Sun Yat-sen, came forward with his constitutional type Three People's Principles (Nationalism, Democracy, and People's Livelihood) and took charge. He found that in a country such as China, as Mao had said after him, that "power comes from the barrel of a gun." So, one of his first accomplishments was the establishment of a top-rank military academy in Wuchang. He appointed a then unknown officer named Chiang Kai-shek to manage the officer's training school. Sun needed aid and he appealed to all the Western Nations, especially the United States where he had spent several months trying to raise funds. But they all turned him down. All except the Soviet Union. It poured in money, weapons, advisors. Consequently, Sun's Kuomintang Party became allied with the Chinese Communist Party. In 1925 Sun died suddenly and Chiang became head of the Kuomintang. All went well for a couple of years. Chiang advanced from the Canton area northward to Nanking, became president of China and named Nanking as the capitol. But meanwhile he had fallen in love. He met Mei-ling, one of the three Soong sisters, daughter of Charles Jones Soong who graduated from Vanderbilt University, returned to Shanghai as a Methodist missionary, later became a wealthy merchant. His three daughters were graduated from Wellesley, were Christians, although Ch'ing-ling who married Sun Yat-sen, later backslid and became a life-long Communist agitator. The second sister, Ai-ling, married H.H.Kung, China's leading banker. And Mei-ling married Chiang, promptly converted him, and advised him to get rid of the Communists in his party. Not only did he disassociate himself, he tried to drive the Communists out of China. Which occasioned the 6,000 mile "long

March" of Mao and his followers from Kiangsi in the south of China to Yenan in the north. Chiang began his war against the Communists by a total purge of Shanghai in 1927. We were there.

After Chiang became president, the Japanese began to fear for its developing "Co-Prosperity Sphere" if China became too powerful and too united. So Japan attacked, we saw yet another blood bath in Shanghai. Meanwhile the Soviets were extending every possible aid to Mao's Chinese Communist Party and that civil war resumed. Chiang seemed undecided as to which was his country's principal enemy. One of his own generals had him kidnapped in order to talk with him and convince him that Japan was the principal enemy. So the Kuomintang and the Communists declared a temporary truce and both fought against the Japanese. This continued until the end of WWII and the defeat of Japan, whereupon the civil war between Chiang's forces and Mao's forces began again and became a total war. All might have gone well except that our State Department had been taken over by the Council on Foreign Relations, which was strongly pro-Mao and anti-Chiang. The CFR sister organization, the Institute of Pacific Relations, did its job well - for Mao and the Communists, that is. Dan Smoot in his The Invisible Government (June, 1962) reported:

Traitors In Washington

"The IPR played a more important role than any other American organization in shaping public opinion and influencing American policy with regard to Asia....In 1951 the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the late Pat McCarran began an investigation (which) was predicated on the assumption that United States diplomacy had never suffered a more disastrous defeat than in its failure to avert the Communist conquest of China (which) led to the Korean war and the tragic mishandling of this war on the part of Washington and United Nations officialdom, destroyed American prestige throughout Asia, and built Chinese Communist military power into a menacing colossus. The Senate Investigation revealed that the American policy decisions which produced these disastrous consequences were made by IPR officials who were traitors, or under the influence of traitors, whose allegiance lay in Moscow." Result: On October 1, 1949, the Communist "Peoples Republic" was proclaimed and the Nationalists under Chiang fled to Taiwan, where they were free and grew prosperous, while the mainland Chinese became hungry slaves.

Mao and his generals were able to end the "rule of the warlords." Land owners were murdered, and the peasants were given some three acres of land each on which they could raise "crops for the country." But this didn't work out too well, because there weren't enough tools or manure to go round. So the land was taken away from the peasants and some 750,000 collective farms were formed. Still, this didn't accomplish what was desired in agricultural growth. Mao & Co. then copied one of Stalin's ploys and announced the first "Five Year Plan" (1953). But socialism wasn't producing the results expected, so in 1958 came "The Great Leap Forward." Carroll Quigley in Tragedy and Hope gives a quite candid

description. "The Great Leap Forward," he wrote, "merged the 750 thousand collective farms into about 26,000 communes of about 5,000 families each. This was a social rather than simply an agrarian revolution, since its aim included the destruction of the family household and the peasant village. All activities of the members, including child rearing, education, entertainment, social life, the militia, and all economic and intellectual life came under the control of the commune. In some areas the previous villages were destroyed and peasants were housed in dormitories, with communal kitchens and mess halls, nurseries for the children, and separation of these children under the communes' control in isolation from their parents at an early age. One purpose of this drastic change was to release large numbers of women from domestic activities so that they could work in fields or factories. In the first year of the Great Leap Forward, 90 million peasant women were relieved of their domestic duties and became available to work for the state."

This total commune-ization of the country was so drastic that even Khrushchev was shocked, spoke out against the policy. That has been cited as one of the reasons why China and the USSR severed relations completely and began massing troops on either side of the Sino-Soviet border. In 1966 came the "great proletarian cultural revolution" in which the youth of the country were mobilized into Red Guards units to "combat erosion of the revolution, and to attack the party and government bureaucracies." This was very similar to the recent peaceful uprising of the students in Beijing. The results in 1966: a purge of the people who protested, as well as a purge in the top party leadership. Much the same had developed when Mao announced his "Hundred Flowers Campaign." He said free criticism of the regime would be permitted, with immunity and without punishment. "Let a hundred flowers bloom and a hundred schools of thought contend." And after those who spoke out for democracy and a kinder and gentler kind of socialism, then came their purge. All the dissidents were declared traitors. Their reward: a bullet in the back of the head.

Opening The Door To Big Business

Meanwhile, the IPR, CFR, US State Department et al were anxious for Communist China to succeed and become a great market for American multinationals, as the USSR was already becoming. The Chinese Communist leadership was also anxious to promote industry and trade. But first, the Peoples Republic of Communist China had to become the holder of a permanent veto in the United Nations Security Council. Then, by secret arrangement, Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon visited the Communist officials in Peking. That "opened the door" to trade and aid and travel, and to the growth of Communist China as a military power. More and more US officials and businessmen visited China, and multinational executives looked gleefully at the possibilities that awaited them. Modern hotels sprang up, soft drink and fast food dispensers appeared, as did various kinds of industries that Cathay had never known before.

So, as President Bush was wont to say, "a new wind was blowing" across the Communist countries. Gorbachev announced his glasnost and perestroika.

In a sense China followed suit. And, as a touch of freedom and free enterprise was permitted, more freedom and free enterprise was demanded by the 'dissidents.' It was Socrates who said: "The young have exalted notions because they have not yet been humbled by life or learned from its necessary limitations. They would always rather do noble deeds than useful ones. Their lives are more regulated by moral feeling than by reasoning. They love too much, hate too much, and the same with everything else. They think they know everything, which is why they overdo everything."

* * *

When Brzezinski wrote about "The Grand Failure" of Communism, we sensed that the world was being prepared for One World Government through the merger of all nations and the New World Order. Demonstrations in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Georgia, even in Warsaw and Moscow, seemed to indicate that the USSR was being altered slightly so it might be comfortably merged with other nations. When USNews headlined its cover of June 19th with the words "Collapse of Communism," and its lead story dealt with the Beijing affair, we felt that Red China too, is being conditioned for the merger. We should remember that these revolts in the USSR and PRC are not demands for liberty and freedom, but merely for a kinder and gentler kind of Communism. And it all could be "planned that way." When Communism was about to collapse, Lenin did it, Stalin did it, and Mao did it. Mao created his Red Guards to make totalitarianism less painful. Then when the Guards began to be successful, he called out his armies to crush them. His "Hundred Flowers" followed the same course. This recent episode could be the same: loosening of the chains for a spell, then re-tightening and the purge. As the Insiders aim for the New World Order to be completely installed by the year 2000, quick work is required if the USSR and the PRC are ready for acceptance. Perhaps it was all planned. There is a Scripture that fits:

"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world."

(I John 4:1)

*** When a British TV reporter approached an American visitor on the Great Wall of China during the time of Nixon and Kissinger's "ping-pong diplomacy", he asked if he was one of the first tourists. The man replied, "No, I'm with the Chase Manhattan Bank."

[Reprinted from **Don Bell Reports**, a fortnightly newsletter available from PO Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480, USA. Foreign air mail subscription: \$50 dollars per annum.]

FOR SALE: Complete year sets of **The Social Crediter** and **The Canadian Social Crediter** dating back to the late 1930s. Send 2x14p stamps for price list to CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £6.00 OVERSEAS £8.00 AIRMAIL U.S. \$15 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

FROM THE SNIPER'S NEST

by FRANK BROOKES

All Europeans now?

Claims by various politicians that the British are "Europeans now", meaning by that that we are "involved" more as "partners" in the EC and convinced of its blessings, seem to me somewhat exaggerated. The European elections recently held in Britain produced an active interest in about a third of the electorate. This indicated not that we are "Europeans now" - in the sense intended by politicians making that claim - but precisely the opposite. Two thirds of us emphasised by our abstention that we are simply not enthusiastic about the EC.

Telegraph wires cut?

There is a lot of political activity meanwhile going on to woo us into supporting the European Monetary System. Following an article in **The Daily Telegraph** on the merits of the EMS, I sent a Letter to the Editor inquiring whether the EMS would operate via debt-free creation or whether it would be the same as now, viz. credit as debt. The letter was not published.

Provocative in our own land?

News from Dewsbury concerned clashes between police and Asians following what the press called "rival meetings" in the town organised by the British National Party and the Kirklees Black Workers' Association. According to **The Sunday Telegraph**, it was "gangs of Asian youths" who "rampaged through Dewsbury" as they headed towards the BNP gathering. Were they, one innocently wonders, going there to listen to what was said? Often the impression is given that these troubles are really created because parties like the BNP are "provocative" to coloured immigrants. Of course, the truth is that the provocation actually arises elsewhere. The British are not provocative in Britain.

Taken for a fool on the democratic see-saw

Opinion polls indicate that the usual "swing" in British politics is about to take place. Tweedledum and Tweedledee are ready to change places again. Labour, once thought to be down and out, has staggered to its feet and is challenging the Conservatives for the job of leading the (once) great British nation into the future. What a laugh! One thing about the British average person is that he/she never learns! Meanwhile, the vexing question of how to present a United Nationalist Front to the people remains unsolved. Partly because of squabbles between Nationalists themselves, partly because people are never allowed to hear the Nationalist voice.

Leftist take-over of the Churches

Meanwhile the Churches continue to egg on attacks and criticisms of South Africa and apartheid. Have you noticed how even the Catholic Church, once outspoken in its condemnations of Communism, has on that subject over the years been totally muted? Presumably it's in conformity with the Rome-Moscow axis perpetrated before Vatican II. But apartheid or fascism or the BNP and National Front? Well, that's different. Church leaders must be held responsible for whatever happens as a result of their public utterances. The people in the pew should, however reluctantly, withhold financial support for churches involved in political posturings. Their charitable status also needs reviewing.

1688 and 1789: HOW NOT TO CELEBRATE A NATIONAL DISASTER

by ARNAUD de LASSUS

[IN 1988, official Protestant England, from the royal family down, celebrated the tercentenary of the so-called "Glorious Revolution", the dethroning of our last Catholic King, James II, in 1688. This year our French neighbours are being called by their Socialist and Masonic masters to celebrate the bicentenary of the bloody revolution of 1789 which banished both natural and Christian values from their public life. For us, both revolutions were historical disasters whose consequences are still with us. The following article voices a rejection of official France's politically-slanted celebration of the "89".]

*

*

*

*

A DECLARATION on the bicentenary of the Revolution by the French bishops' conference was published in **La Croix** of 31st October, 1988. From this we quote two essential passages:

"...The Revolution was a serious tribulation for the Church of France. It divided clergy and faithful. Many wanted to remain Catholic by maintaining full communion with the Pope; for this communion guaranteed the Church's spiritual freedom in its relations with any temporal power. They were persecuted and forced to bear witness to the point of death; some of them are today honoured as martyrs. Others, veritable confessors to the faith, devoted their whole lives to it at this darkest hour when their opponents were attempting to de-Christianise France. They continued to celebrate the sacraments and strengthened the majority of the population in its rejection of this anti-religious policy. Others struggled for the recognition of their right to believe in God and serve Him within the new society that was being built. We cannot help but feel our solidarity with these, our elder brothers in the faith...

"1789 and its Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen set out the basic conditions for a responsible society, and such a society remains the objective of our generation and of today's Christians. We are not asked to forget the fact that, as at any moment in history, many of its words and deeds were unjust, even if good elements were mixed up with the bad ones, and that at that time more than at others, many were tempted to transform their own political options into absolute and sacred principles and to condemn their opponents without right of appeal. But two centuries later, it is easier to avoid these exaggerations and focus attention on the positive values we have inherited from the revolutionary period, values that have been instrumental in determining the nature of modern France, and that have been adopted as models by so many nations throughout the world. We shall gather at Notre-Dame de Paris in the early summer of 1989. There we shall commemorate those days when, through its representatives, many of whom belonged to the clergy, a whole people expressed its readiness to live together and seek respect for man as its particular ideal..."

*

*

*

*

What do these passages boil down to? According to the first, the French Revolution did its best to break the communion of Frenchmen with Rome and then de-Christianise France; it made martyrs and pursued an anti-Christian policy rejected by most of the population, and tried to

deny the French the right to believe in God and serve Him. It thus interfered with the most sacred right of the human person (that of believing in and serving the true God) and showed a total lack of respect for flesh-and-blood Frenchmen, the overwhelming majority of whom were Catholics (and monarchists for that matter). The second passage carries a quite different message. 1789 and its Declaration of the Rights of Man are said to have "set out the basic conditions for a responsible society". And "those days" are supposed to have manifested the readiness of a people "to live together and seek respect for man as its particular ideal."

The general impression left by the bishops' declaration is faithfully summed up in this sentence from the comment of **La Croix**: "Despite its faults and its crimes, the French Revolution remains a decisive step forward in our awareness of the dignity of the human person". In short, the balance is a positive one, so positive that it can be commemorated in Notre-Dame de Paris, whereas there appears to be no question of celebrating the memory of those martyred by the fury of the revolutionaries.

*

*

*

*

"A serene and conciliatory message" is **La Croix's** final judgement on the declaration. We see it rather as a scandalous and contradictory message, which offends against the most elementary historical truth and against our honour as Catholics and Frenchmen.

It is contradictory in that the bishops' conference professes its loyalty to Rome, and yet in the early summer of 1989 it intends to commemorate a movement which ever since 1789 has done its best to separate the French Church from Rome. It professes its loyalty to Rome and yet praises the 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man which Rome has condemned on several occasions, and which Pope Pius VI considered as "so hostile to the Church and to society". It is scandalous: true, that at one point the Revolution's persecutions and martyrs and its aim of de-Christianising France are mentioned, but the balance of the text makes it clear that these are mere accidents, events of secondary importance whose commemoration is not called for, as can be seen in the trite remark "at any moment in history, many of its words and deeds were unjust."

It offends against the most elementary historical truth. How can one write that "1789 and its Declaration of the Rights of Man set out the basic conditions for a responsible society" when their immediate consequence was systematically to liquidate the natural leaders of society in a process described thus by the positivist, Hippolyte Taine? "On one side, robbed of all protection from the common law, exiled, in prison, under the pikes, on the scaffold, were the elite of France, practically everyone of breeding, blood, wealth or merit, those distinguished by their intelligence, culture, talent or virtue; on the other side, above the common law, in posts of dignity and unlimited power, irresponsible dictatorship, arbitrary commissions and judicial sovereignty, was a bunch of rootless men from all walks of life, upstarts marked by self-conceit and humbug, brutality and crime" [**La Revolution**, vol. III, p. 456].

How can one imply that "the days of 1789" had respect for human rights as their particular objective when 1789 visibly marked the beginning

of a regime of murder and pillage and the development of a revolutionary process of which Pope Pius XI could write: "A fearful and regrettable sedition, the complete overturning of the social regime that raged in France at the end of the 18th century and hatefully persecuted things divine and human, the king, the nobility, and most especially the Church of Christ and its ministers" [Apostolic Letter announcing the beatification of Pierre-Rene Rogue, 10th May 1934].

It offends against our honour as Catholics and Frenchmen. The Revolution has revealed to us a glorious army of martyrs and confessors: bishops, priests, religious, nobles and commoners, military leaders, soldiers, peasants, women and children... They stayed faithful to their religious and political duties. But it is not these heroes who will be commemorated this summer at Notre-Dame de Paris, but the imposture against which they fought... and we use the word "imposture" advisedly for the false and deceptive revolutionary ideology and the manner of its imposition from 1789 to its logical climax in 1793.

*

*

*

*

We are sure that not all our bishops approve of this collective declaration on the bicentenary of 1789 that has been issued in their name. Might it not be worthwhile for each of us to ask his own bishop, either to dissociate himself from a text that is as despicable as it is scandalous, or, if he feels that collegiality inhibits him from this, to organise in his own diocese ceremonies in honour of the martyrs and all those who defended the faith in the revolutionary period, and to issue his own declaration emphasising the essentially masonic and anti-Catholic character of the 1789 Revolution?

In this intention let us pray the 374 beatified martyrs of the Revolution to intercede for us, and in particular those three of them who were bishops (and who were martyred at the Carmelite convent in Paris on 2nd September, 1792): Blessed Jean-Marie du Lau, Archbishop of Arles, Blessed Francois Joseph de la Rochefoucauld, Bishop of Beauvais, and Blessed Pierre-Louis de la Rochefoucauld, Bishop of Saintes.

Martyrs of the French Revolution beatified by St Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XI, Pius XII and John Paul II

- * 191 bishops, priests and laity massacred at the Carmelite convent, the Abbaye and Saint-Firmin (Paris)
- * Noel Pinot and the 99 other martyrs of Angers
- * 19 priests guillotined at Laval * 32 nuns guillotined at Orange
- * 4 Daughters of Charity of Arras, guillotined at Cambrai
- * 16 Carmelite nuns of Compiègne, guillotined at Paris
- * 11 Ursuline nuns, guillotined at Valenciennes
- * Pierre-Rene Rogue, Lazarist, guillotined at Vannes

[Editor's note - A reader tells us that a "celebration" of the bicentenary of the foul French Revolution is listed in the current calendar of events issued by the Richmond-upon-Thames Arts Council. "How can one celebrate," he asks, "that hideous shame of France: liberte de mal faire, egalite de misere, fraternite de Cain et frere?" Perhaps the Arts Council would like to lay on, as well, a celebration of the bombing of Dresden? The most apt comment to sum up the Revolution is that it tried to create a ten-month year, but the Moon would not conform.]

CUT AND THRUST

by JANUS

THE Treasury is proposing that many of our troops in Ulster lose their right to free board and lodging. This is to gain "value for money" in public expenditure. Why not carry this further? Soldiers should pay rent for their rifles and be charged a small sum for each bullet that they discharge. This would be in line with the Chinese system whereby the next-of-kin of people executed by being shot in the back of the neck have to pay for the cost of one cartridge.

SURELY the most effective way of turning Britain into a strong, vibrant and entrepreneurial economy would be to allow all the 3.5 Hong Kongese to settle here by 1997. Are not these people the very epitome of all that dear Mrs Thatcher admires about the unfettered spirit of free enterprise? Well, before you lynch me I'll come clean and say that you have to be a fool or a knave to suggest the foregoing, although that was precisely the viewpoint of David Page of Essex University's Dept. of Government in an **Independent** letter on June 9th. How he imagines Britain can absorb such an influx, Heaven only knows. New urban areas half the size of London would have to be built in the next eight years, with "standing room only" the order of the day in an already-overpopulated south-east. Then there are all their dependents and relatives, many of whom live elsewhere in the Far East but would, under our liberal immigration law, also have the right to roost here.

AS for any "moral obligation", articulated in **The Times** on June 10th by the bag of wind known as Eldon Griffiths MP, I am conscious of no such responsibility towards Hong Kong. Rather, the colony's population should be grateful that it has had the enormous benefits of a period of British rule which was always known to end in 1997. Why on earth should we be obliged to continue them in perpetuity and at potentially enormous cost to Britain?

I HAVE just seen the tail-end of a film on television about the Battle of Britain. There was lots of thrilling aerial combat, with Spitfires going down like wildfires. Then came a summary at the end of all the pilots: so many UK, Canadian, US, Irish, Poles, Czechs, etc., ending "1 Israeli"! Am I crazy or was there an Israel in 1940? I thought the Zionist state was one of the spoils (in more ways than one) of victory.

THERE was another dramatic programme on the "box" recently about the danger to the physical world of the greenhouse effect. It was noticeable that one theme was plugged throughout, and that was the need for overall global control. World government was not actually mentioned, merely suggested. The trouble is, of course, that if we have world government, who is going to rule the world? No doubt it will be explained as a very democratic proposition, with people free to elect whomever they choose. However, we have an elected body in this country, but would anyone maintain that it actually rules Great Britain? Or that the wishes of the majority have any bearing on the conduct of affairs?

GENERAL Jaruzelski paid a visit to Britain a short time ago. It is understood that he wants to arrange credit of some sort in order to help Poland out of its economic mess. A TV commentator, reporting on the funeral of the Ayatollah, mentioned in passing that the new Iranian

leader would doubtless want to arrange a foreign loan to help Iran recover from the effect of the war with Iraq. And to plug the hole in the ozone layer, it seems that large sums of money will be required for the Third World. Curious, isn't it, how almost everything that happens nowadays involves money lending. This is nothing new. When Antonio was the victim of a maritime disaster, Shylock readily lent him money - on terms, of course!

A NEW Israeli computer game has players competing to kill, injure or round up the most Palestinian protesters in simulated confrontations. The final score lists Palestinians killed outright, injured, jailed or dying of injuries in hospital. Should a similar game be marketed here for British players with immigrants as victims, what horror and indignation there would be, with calls for the makers of the game to be punished with life imprisonment at the very least - even though the British in this case are the indigenous population and not the influx!

LESBIANS are being offered free self-defence classes by the Labour Council of Ealing (which has just imposed a 31% rate increase). A council spokesman (?) said, "There are experiences which lesbians share in common and they are not necessarily the same experiences shared by other women." It isn't clear precisely what he meant by this. Presumably, the self-defence is in case of a threat of rape. At the risk of seeming unchivalrous, one would have thought that a lesbian was less at risk than most females - except from another lesbian!

RECENTLY, this column suggested that those likely to be sent to prison should become members of the Reformed Church of Sybarites in order to better their conditions while "inside". However, truth can always overtake fiction. After a prisoner escaped from a police cell a search revealed: 41 books, a colour TV set, a bottle of beer, a personal stereo player, jars of chutney, an empty cigar-box and some Blu-Tak. The bars of the cell (which had been glued back into place) fell out during the search, having gone unnoticed until then. The prisoner, of course, had escaped. Presumably the sound of the stereo drowned the noise of the bars being sawn through. Or was the cell a "no go" area for warders?

ETHNIC minority children now make up most of the 250,000 pupils in Inner London schools. But "most" surely implies a majority. Riddle: when is a majority a minority? Answer: when it is ethnic.

NO LEASE TO BE RELEASED

"HONG Kong was never leased from China. It is British sovereign territory, ceded to this country by the Treaty of Nanking in 1842. The same is true of the Kowloon Peninsula, which became British sovereign territory by the Treaty of Tientsin in 1860. Mrs Thatcher's surrender of these Crown possessions in the 1984 treaty should not be confused with the expiry of the 1898 lease on the New Territories."

- B.J. Benjamin in *The Independent*, 9th June.

FOR SALE! Vintage nationalist pamphlets and papers. Please write for a sales list by enclosing two 14p stamps to CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT, FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HAMPSHIRE GU33 7DD.

A STICK FOR THE SOUTH AFRICAN DOG

by NOEL HUNT

"THE world is naturally averse to all the truth it sees or hears, but swallows nonsense and a lie with greediness and gluttony." [Butler, **Hudibras**]

THE proverb tells us that it is easy to find a stick to beat a dog. The truth of this adage is brought to mind by a recent statement in one of our "quality" newspapers. The item dealt with the efforts being made by South African companies, Consolidated Goldfields in particular, to establish bases overseas. Consgold is said to be part of the Anglo-American financial empire. We are told that the companies concerned seek to detach themselves from the South African doctrine of apartheid, now under attack from all sides.

The news item continues: "But anti-apartheid campaigners regard Anglo's liberalism as cosmetic because the apartheid system underpins the Anglo and de Beers vast wealth." This view is not without irony, since many people regard Anglo-American and de Beers as the two greatest enemies of the White man in South Africa. The ritual cursing of South Africa whenever the name of the country is heard has now become so automatic that this sort of modish nonsense about "cosmetic liberalism" is swallowed unthinkingly by many.

Africans Desperate For Employment

The fact is that Anglo-American, de Beers, Consgold and for that matter all the other multi-nationals are not being anti-apartheid in this case. Their views and policies are directed, and rightly, towards making a profit for their companies. The fact is that throughout Africa south of the Sahara there is a vast pool of labour, desperate for employment. Many of them once had jobs in their home countries, jobs provided and created by White men who developed what the Black would not, and could not, exploit. Liberals and similar useful tools throughout the West ensured that the White was driven out, leaving the luckless Blacks to the mercy of grubby little gangsters built up by the world media into "statesmen" and "democrats". Economic disaster inevitably followed. Tens of thousands were thrown out of work.

The South African gold mines, the diamond diggings, industry and the White farming sector all need labour. To meet this demand, recruiting companies have set up centres in which they recruit labour for work in South Africa. Black men fleeing the curses of "freedom" and "democracy" imposed upon their countries by the West walk for hundreds of dangerous miles to reach these centres. Here they are medically examined and tested for intelligence and aptitude. Those selected for employment in South Africa are regarded by their friends as exceptionally fortunate. They eagerly sign contracts of service binding themselves to work for a specified period in return for stated conditions of pay, rations and housing. There was a time, when the White ruled in their countries of origin, when a portion of their weekly wage was held back and remitted to their home districts to help their relatives. Once the endemic corruption of Africa had replaced the standards enforced by the Whites, this system had to be abandoned.

But, asks the liberal anxiously, do these simple men know what they are signing? Indeed they do. The terms and conditions of service are set out in minute detail in a written contract. This is explained to the recruit in his own language by an interpreter provided by the company. The recruit may accept or reject the terms. If he accepts, he receives a copy of the contract. It never crosses his mind that the company will not honour its obligations in full. The recruit is now transported to South Africa, which he enters with a sigh of relief. He is now sure of food, housing, wages and decent treatment, with a Government Department to make sure that he gets it. It does not worry him in the slightest that he is now living under the evil system of apartheid. Tribal Africa knows no other system, and so he regards it as right and proper. He practises it himself as naturally and unthinkingly as he breathes.

The liberal may find this shocking, but it is a fact. Black Africa discriminates both racially and tribally. Labour gangs on the mines are not made up of all-comers. On the contrary, they are made up of members of the same tribe who know and trust each other. Nor do they live dispersedly in the hostels provided. Each barrack room is occupied by members of the same tribe. Thus workers can go on shift knowing that those off shift are of their tribe and that their possessions are therefore safe.

South Africa's Magnetic Attraction

It should be clear that apartheid has nothing to do with "underpinning the vast wealth of de Beers and Anglo". What has happened is that White liberalism allied to African incompetence have created a vast labour pool in sub-Saharan Africa. South African companies draw on this vast pool. They pay what they and the labourers both regard as a fair wage. Apartheid has nothing to do with it. Supply and demand has. Having completed his contract, the employee is returned free of charge to his home country. Here he is likely to sign on again for a further spell in South Africa as soon as he can. In other words, he does his best to ensure that he again becomes subject to all the evils of apartheid against which the rest of the world fulminates at such length.

All these facts are disappointing to those who see every Black as being adamantly opposed to apartheid. But there is yet worse. Every day of every week of the year, except Sundays, a train leaves Johannesburg railway station for the north. It carries over a thousand Blacks being deported as illegal immigrants to South Africa. This means that tens of thousands of Blacks have made the hazardous journey from their villages, possibly as far away as Angola, to the South African border. There they slip illegally across and seek employment. They will do anything to be allowed to live and work in South Africa. They do all this, presumably, in order that they may be oppressed and downtrodden by the Whites. Either these Blacks are masochists to a man, loving to kiss the South African knout,, or the liberals lie when they say that Blacks loathe apartheid.

But, you may ask, why cannot South Africa's own Blacks take up the jobs for which foreigners compete so savagely? They do not take the jobs for a very good reason: life is so good in the homelands and townships set up for them by the oppressive White man that they do not need employment. Yet we still continue to hear and read fashionable nonsense about the universal Black detestation of the South African political system. A lie can travel round the world while Truth is pulling on her boots.

THE INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT

by PETER BURDON

I THINK it was G.K. Chesterton who once wrote that if you believe you know the truth you must never lose an opportunity to hammer it home, even if it sounds absurd and even if you are in a minority of one. Fine: all the Chestertons had blazing courage and formidable intellects. Of weaker fibre, I confess that I need occasional reassurance and support. Those early **Candour** Annual Dinners gave one perhaps the only chance in a whole year to spend a few hours with people on the same wavelength. And there were always stirring speeches from A.K. We invariably went home with fire in our bellies.

The pace of Britain's decline is now so accelerated and so accepted on all sides that I frankly admit to faltering occasionally. Was one of my friends right when he expostulated: "You've got international finance, secret government and treason on the brain"? Chance purchases of old books for a few pence (thanks, Oxfam, just this once) have convinced me that I have distinguished and unsuspected company.

Butler's Blunt Truths

Sir William Butler published his biography of General Gordon in 1887. Dealing with the delay in the dispatch of the Nile Expedition, he draws a clear distinction between what he calls the temporary and permanent governments of England: "There is a government in England...which is always in office - a government that has no more relation to the will of the people than it has to the wishes of the people of Van Dieman Land."

Butler was a Tipperary Irishman who served in the British Army for nearly fifty years, retiring in 1905 in the rank of Lieut.-General. He served in Burma, India and the Ashanti and Zulu wars. He wrote a report on his travels in the Canadian west that directly led to the formation of the North-West Mounted Police. He was responsible to Wolseley for the organisation of the Nile Flotilla in the desperate gamble to save Gordon. When Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces in South Africa he was accused of pro-Boer sympathies and was forced to resign. The truth appears to be that he considered it calamitous that the two white peoples there should go to war with each other. He warned that the country might never recover. He also protested that the War Office had completely underestimated the will and power of the Boers to resist. The war, he felt, was set in motion by vast corporations, international banking houses and armaments manufacturers. He had to go, of course!

Butler was the friend of many great men (Victor Hugo, Ruskin, Gordon and Parnell, for example) who accepted him on their own intellectual level. He was well acquainted (but not always friendly!) with the leading politicians of the day. He wrote fifteen successful books of biography, travel and military history and a host of brilliant reports to his military commanders. Undoubtedly, he was one of the most acute minds of the day.

Another forgotten book is John Morley's **Life of W.E. Gladstone** in which the Grand Old Man is reported as writing: "From the day I took office as Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852) I began to learn that the State

held, in the face of the Bank and the City, an essentially false position as to finance...the Government was to leave the money power supreme and unquestioned." (The G.O.M. would be astounded today could he but see how the money power has built up and entrenched its hold over all states.)

H.G. Wells anticipated **Candour** by exactly 33 years in an article that appeared in the **Sunday Express** on 27 November, 1920. "Big business," he wrote, "is by no means antipathetic to Communism. The larger big business grows the more it approximates to Collectivism. It is the upper road of the few instead of the lower road of the masses to Collectivism." (There is a whiff of the **Protocols** about that, is there not?) Then, not long before his death in 1950, J.C. Smuts, statesman, scholar and soldier, said: "I am sure there is some hidden pressure behind all the worries of Europe, Asia and America."

Butler wrecked his career in pursuit of truth; Gladstone, wily politician, kept his thoughts locked away in his memoir; Wells revealed the truth about Collectivism, of which he was a fervent advocate; Smuts, after a life of astonishing achievement, was uneasy and puzzled by the darkening scene. Think of it: 137 years have passed since Gladstone acknowledged his real masters; 102 years since Butler's outburst; 69 years since Wells lifted the lid on Collectivism; 40 years since Smuts uneasily pondered the possibility of the Hidden Hand.

How long, O Lord, how long?

VIPERS, WITH FORKED TONGUES

THE Israeli Prime Minister, Mr Mishmash Sham-Ear (or words to that effect), was with us for a couple of days in May. B.B.C. Radio 4's report on what the Sunday papers say told us that one of them expressed the hope that Israel would get something better from here "than Foreign Office advice to commit suicide." South Africa, please note, though no Sunday paper will thus diagnose British Government policy towards her. And as for the Rhodesians, they took the proffered hemlock long ago.

Remarkably little fuss was made about the coming of the Israeli Prime Minister to our green and pleasant land. Just his presence noted occasionally in the news columns, buried among all the other news items. Yet this is the sick murderer who, in the last years of the Palestine Mandate, left the terrorist group Irgun Zvai Leumi for the Stern Gang because the former was "too moderate"! As Stern's operations chief, he was responsible for the murder of Lord Moyne. This is the man who is leading Israel today and sanctioning continuing atrocities against men, women and children, only this time they are the hapless inhabitants of the West Bank.

The self-opinionated, so-called right-wing columnist of the **Sunday Express**, John Junor, did wonder why so many people were "taken in by this fat, greasy little squirt" - only he was referring to Yasser Arafat!

Read SPEARHEAD. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the British National Party. Sample copy 80p or annual subscription £10. Available from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

SOUTH AFRICA AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

"THE Soviet policies of glasnost and perestroika had created a new international climate which also demands that South Africa should review its attitudes, General Magnus Malan, Minister of Defence told Parliament yesterday. There has been great interest in Parliament in the contact between South Africa and the Soviet Union. It is known that both Gen. Malan and Mr Pik Botha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, have had talks with Russian diplomats.... General Malan said as compared with East-West conflict and confrontation in the past, it appeared that a new world order was developing, including subtle changes in world trade.... 'The question is, what should South Africa's position be in the new developing world order?'" [The Citizen, 21st April]

So what's the next step? A visit by David Rockefeller for talks with Pik and the General about "raising pigs"? [vide Candour, March/April].

TOP OF THE LOADSAMONEY LEAGUE

"THE Sunday Times survey of Britain's rich was surprising in that some of the wealthy members of the community that we might have expected to be included in the 'Top 200' were not there - simply because they were not rich enough - well, by the standards set by the Sunday Times research staff. Of the 200 most wealthy people listed were some 32 Anglo-Jewish individuals and families - four of them in the top 20. In the upper band came publisher Robert Maxwell, ranked 11th with £675 million; Gerald Ronson, the property and investment tycoon, 12th with £500 million; Alan Sugar, the Amstrad computer entrepreneur, 14th with £432 million; and at joint 20th Sigismund Berger, Britain's largest residential landlord, with £300 million." [Jewish Chronicle, 7th April]

TAPES FROM FOREST HOUSE. Send for our list of cassette tapes by A.K. Chesterton, Rosine de Bouneville, Oswald Mosley and many other nationalist speakers, past and present. Stirring music tapes also available. Send two 14p stamps to CANDOUR TAPES, FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HANTS.

MORE ON MR SMEDLEY

ONE of our readers has written to tell us something about the people with whom Mr Oliver Smedley [vide Candour, June] does business. Last year he wrote an anti-EC book entitled **Out**, which was published by an outfit called Classic Press of London SW7. Our reader ordered a batch in February and the cheque was cashed within days. Yet it took weeks of letter writing and telephoning before the books were supplied, and that was only after a threat to complain to the police and an actual complaint to the local Trading Standards Officer! Whenever our reader rang, he found himself talking to some bumptious yuppie-sounding clown calling himself the London School of Investment, who denied all connection with Classic Press. Well, well! Surely the good Mr Smedley would have been better employed in seeing that people who pay for his book actually receive copies without weeks of hassle than in writing impudent and ill-informed tirades to far better men than himself who, incidentally, have been dead for sixteen years!